

emphasizes a small point of a large whole which has no value in itself.

The West has lost the macrocosmic attitude and quality of mind, for with all its specialization we have lost the feeling of intrinsic unity. Cures in medicine, dogmas and sects in religion, sub-divisions in degrees and examinations, are all signs of disastrous specialization and do serious damage to the integrity of life.

What then is the human basis with regard to language and philology? Firstly, we do not want to know only what a word *means* (for that means only putting one synonym for another) but what it *is*, i.e., *the condition of consciousness which it represented in the original speaker*. It is not the meaning we want to get at but its *effect*; and that is beyond the sphere of philology, it belongs to philosophy and intuition. It is the same with every work of art, every expression of the human mind. It is not enough to examine it from the scientific and anthropomorphic point of view only (i.e., critically and aesthetically), but we must ask ourselves: What made the people do this and what did they feel when they did it, what is the meaning and purpose of it, and how does it represent a part of the World-Soul? Every work of art must make us feel the same as it made those feel who created it, and it must bring us nearer to the understanding of the World Spirit. We must in other words not make a historical study of it but place ourselves on the same plane of time and space and consider it from the *timeless* point of view, *sub specie aeternitatis*. Nothing can be satisfactorily explained or understood without referring it ultimately to its universal source.

Secondly, in emphasizing the subconscious character of language the most wonderful thing is how *sense* springs up unconsciously out of emotion. Man feels and desires and utters his emotions in sounds which form words, and when he examines these words with his reason he suddenly finds that there is *sense* in them—sense which was not premeditated nor expected, sense which comes we know not wherefrom, which is an immediate revelation of the rational universe. The problem is not: "How is language made to fit the sense?" but, "How is it that sense fits the language?" Thus we must suppose that there is an equal sense in the utterance of all creatures, and we may be able to compare their relative sense, or the meaning of their language, and thus with deeper intuition come to *know* the language of *all* living beings.

The interesting factor in the deeper interpretation of language is that it is impossible from the point of view of reason, as the combination of imagination and reason rests on what to us is chance. We always want to know too much. So *this* part of the philosophy or psychology of language escapes philology altogether. Reason and sense in language do not lie in the words themselves, but in the arrangement of the words.

Thus a language of 400 words can and does have as much reason and explains and pictures as much of the universe as a language of 4,000 and more words; in fact the latter destroys by too much reason and artificiality the simplicity and forcefulness of the original natural connec-